

7-18-77

Theory in Biology

1. Yes it is a mess. But perhaps Biology is not a fundamental science, but as many people have said, only a particularist excrement on physics; with evolution about the only theoretical principle; so it is not so far removed from history.

-- To the extent that is so, there may not be that much place for theoretical or physical thinking in biology; and perhaps we should still be grateful for the gadgetry and measurement that 'physicists' help to offer our descriptive pursuits.

As to Mendel--it is a myth that he was simply overlooked. The main villain seems to be Naegeli, who plainly could not have understood Mendel's numerology; so there is some merit in Bronowski's remark. (But if, say, Darwin or Weissman had gotten hold of Mendel's results, I would guess there would have been some chance of its catching on. What was so different in the overall community outlook in 1900?)
--Where did Bronowski say what you attributed

More nonsense than not has been written about Mendel's discovery and its obscuration; but particularly critical and well-informed are L.C. Dunn's "A Short History of Genetics"; McGraw Hill, 1965; and his chapter in Caspari & Ravin, eds., Genetic Organization, Acad. Press, 1969.

Since Mendelism is assuredly Genetics' major theoretical triumph, this indeed should tempt you to look further.

7(3)

PROFESSOR JOSHUA LEDERBERG
Department of Genetics
School of Medicine
Stanford University
Stanford, California 94305